



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/727,659	12/01/2000	Mark F. McLellan	52534-5001	2033

28977 7590 02/23/2004

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1701 MARKET STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-2921

EXAMINER

WILSON, YOLANDA L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2113

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2004

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/727,659

Applicant(s)

MCLELLAN ET AL.

Examiner

Yolanda Wilson

Art Unit

2113

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 December 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-68 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22, 23-27, 28-32, 33-42, 43-48, 49, 52, 53, 56-58 and 60-68 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 50, 51, 54, 55 and 59 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 50,51,54,55,59 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-22,23-27,28-32,33-42,43-48,49,52,53,56,60-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pete J. Welter in view of D. Geller. As appears in claim 1, Welter discloses (A) monitoring said site for an error; and (B) sending a notification to a representative of a proprietor of said site in the event said error is detected on said site; wherein step (B) is at least initially performed without advance permission of the representative of said proprietor for at least an initial period on page 2, under subheading 'Web Server Monitoring' – page 4 and on page 5, under subheading 'Managing Problems When They Occur' – page 6.

Welter fails to explicitly state wherein a fee is not charged for said monitoring service for a free time period. Geller discloses this limitation on page 6, under subheading User Recommendations, "Note that SiteSeer is available for a free ten-day

Art Unit: 2113

trial. This trial offers monitoring of up to five URLs, notification by beeper or e-mail and SiteSeer's regular reports."

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a fee not charged for said monitoring service for a free time period. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have a fee is not charged for said monitoring service for a free time period because comparisons can be made between products by different competitors to see which products are liked to the best. Geller discloses on page 6, "At least some competitors make a similar offer. There might be differences between competitors in price and other details that appeal to you, but if you want to move quickly you won't be disappointed with SiteSeer."

4. As per claim 2, Welter discloses (A) monitoring said site for an error; and (B) sending a notification to a representative of a proprietor of a linked site, which is linked to said site, in the event said error is detected on said site; wherein step (B) is at least initially performed without advance permission of a representative of a proprietor of said site for at least an initial time period on page 2, under subheading 'Web Server Monitoring' – page 4 and on page 5, under subheading 'Managing Problems When They Occur' – page 6.

Welter fails to explicitly state wherein a fee is not charged for said monitoring service for a free time period. Geller discloses this limitation on page 6, under subheading User Recommendations, "Note that SiteSeer is available for a free ten-day

trial. This trial offers monitoring of up to five URLs, notification by beeper or e-mail and SiteSeer's regular reports."

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a fee not charged for said monitoring service for a free time period. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have a fee is not charged for said monitoring service for a free time period because comparisons can be made between products by different competitors to see which products are liked to the best. Geller discloses on page 6, "At least some competitors make a similar offer. There might be differences between competitors in price and other details that appeal to you, but if you want to move quickly you won't be disappointed with SiteSeer."

5. As per claim 3, Welter discloses (A) monitoring said site for an error; and (B) sending a notification to a representative of a proprietor of a linked site, which is linked to said site, in the event said error is detected on said site; wherein step (B) is at least initially performed without advance permission of said representative of said proprietor of said linked site for at least an initial time period on page 2, under subheading 'Web Server Monitoring' – page 4 and on page 5, under subheading 'Managing Problems When They Occur' – page 6.

Welter fails to explicitly state wherein a fee is not charged for said monitoring service for a free time period. Geller discloses this limitation on page 6, under subheading User Recommendations, "Note that SiteSeer is available for a free ten-day

trial. This trial offers monitoring of up to five URLs, notification by beeper or e-mail and SiteSeer's regular reports."

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a fee not charged for said monitoring service for a free time period. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have a fee is not charged for said monitoring service for a free time period because comparisons can be made between products by different competitors to see which products are liked to the best. Geller discloses on page 6, "At least some competitors make a similar offer. There might be differences between competitors in price and other details that appeal to you, but if you want to move quickly you won't be disappointed with SiteSeer."

6. As per claim 4, Welter discloses (A) monitoring said site for an error; and (B) sending a notification to an interested third party, wherein said interested third party is a party other than a representative of a proprietor of said site, in the event said error is detected on said site; wherein step (B) is at least initially performed without advance permission of said representative of said proprietor for at least an initial time period on page 2, under subheading 'Web Server Monitoring' – page 4 and on page 5, under subheading 'Managing Problems When They Occur' – page 6.

Welter fails to explicitly state wherein a fee is not charged for said monitoring service for a free time period. Geller discloses this limitation on page 6, under subheading User Recommendations, "Note that SiteSeer is available for a free ten-day

trial. This trial offers monitoring of up to five URLs, notification by beeper or e-mail and SiteSeer's regular reports."

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a fee not charged for said monitoring service for a free time period. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have a fee is not charged for said monitoring service for a free time period because comparisons can be made between products by different competitors to see which products are liked to the best. Geller discloses on page 6, "At least some competitors make a similar offer. There might be differences between competitors in price and other details that appeal to you, but if you want to move quickly you won't be disappointed with SiteSeer."

7. As per claim 5, Welter discloses (A) monitoring said site for an error; and (B) sending a notification to an interested third party, wherein said interested third party is a party other than a representative of a proprietor of said site, in the event said error is detected on said site; wherein step (B) is at least initially performed without advance permission of said interested third party for at least an initial time period on page 2, under subheading 'Web Server Monitoring' – page 4 and on page 5, under subheading 'Managing Problems When They Occur' – page 6.

Welter fails to explicitly state wherein a fee is not charged for said monitoring service for a free time period. Geller discloses this limitation on page 6, under subheading User Recommendations, "Note that SiteSeer is available for a free ten-day

trial. This trial offers monitoring of up to five URLs, notification by beeper or e-mail and SiteSeer's regular reports."

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a fee not charged for said monitoring service for a free time period. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have a fee is not charged for said monitoring service for a free time period because comparisons can be made between products by different competitors to see which products are liked to the best. Geller discloses on page 6, "At least some competitors make a similar offer. There might be differences between competitors in price and other details that appeal to you, but if you want to move quickly you won't be disappointed with SiteSeer."

8. As per claims 6 and 7, Welter discloses wherein said interested third party is selected from the group consisting of: an entity which offers one or more products which are similar to one or more products offered on said site; an entity which offers one or more services which are similar to one or more services offered on said site; an entity which advertises products on said site; a consumer of products offered on said site; an entity which has a financial interest in said site; an entity which sells advertising space on said site; a press member; and an entity advising a third party who has an interest in the site on page 5, under subheading 'Managing Problems When They Occur' – page 6.

9. As per claims 8-12, Welter discloses wherein step (B) is performed after expiration of the initial time period only upon granting of permission by said

representative of said proprietor of said site on page 5, under subheading 'Managing Problems When They Occur' – page 6.

10. As per claims 13-16, Welter discloses wherein said notification comprises an offer of enhanced services on page 5, under subheading 'Managing Problems When They Occur' – page 6.

11. As per claim 17, Welter discloses wherein said notification comprises an offer of monitoring services on page 5, under subheading 'Managing Problems When They Occur' – page 6.

12. As per claims 18-22, Welter discloses monitoring step comprises the steps of: (1) attempting to download only a header from said site; (2) detecting said error if said attempting is unsuccessful; and (3) repeating steps (1) and (2) at regular intervals on page 3, under subheading 'Monitoring Strategy' – page 5.

13. As per claims 23-27, Welter discloses monitoring step comprises the steps of: (1) attempting to download at least one of computer programming language and graphics from said site; (2) detecting said error if said attempting is unsuccessful; and (3) repeating steps (1) and (2) at regular intervals on page 2, under subheading 'Identifying Critical Web Server Components' – page 5.

14. As per claims 28-32 The method of claim 1 wherein said monitoring step comprises the steps of: (1) attempting to download an entire page from said site; (2) detecting said error if said attempting is unsuccessful; and (3) repeating steps (1) and (2) at regular intervals on page 3, under subheading 'Monitoring Strategy' – page 5.

15. As per claims 33-37, Welter discloses said monitoring is performed from a plurality of remote locations on page 2, under subheading 'Web Server Monitoring', last paragraph.

16. As per claims 38-42, Welter discloses said monitoring is performed from said plurality of remote locations in a cycle on page 2, under subheading 'Web Server Monitoring', last paragraph.

17. As per claims 43-47, Welter discloses (C) sending a notification to the representative of the proprietor of said site in the event said error detected on said site ceases to exist on page 3, under subheading 'Monitoring Strategy' – page 6.

18. As per claim 48, Welter discloses identifying at least one appropriate electronic mail address to which a notification is sent upon an occurrence of an error in a site located on a global communications network, wherein said site is being monitored for the occurrence of errors, comprising the steps of: (A) extracting at least one electronic mail address from said site; (B) assigning each said electronic mail address one or more categories; (C) assigning each said electronic mail address a priority; and (D) identifying, based upon said priority, the at least one appropriate electronic mail address to which said electronic notification is sent upon said occurrence of said error in said site; wherein said notification is at least initially performed without the advance permission of a representative of a proprietor of the site on page 5, under subheading 'Managing Problems When They Occur' – page 6.

Welter fails to explicitly state wherein a fee is not charged for said monitoring service for a free time period. Geller discloses this limitation on page 6, under

Art Unit: 2113

subheading User Recommendations, "Note that SiteSeer is available for a free ten-day trial. This trial offers monitoring of up to five URLs, notification by beeper or e-mail and SiteSeer's regular reports."

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a fee not charged for said monitoring service for a free time period. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have a fee is not charged for said monitoring service for a free time period because comparisons can be made between products by different competitors to see which products are liked to the best. Geller discloses on page 6, "At least some competitors make a similar offer. There might be differences between competitors in price and other details that appeal to you, but if you want to move quickly you won't be disappointed with SiteSeer."

19. As per claim 49, Welter discloses wherein said one or more categories are assigned based on several factors comprising a subject matter of said electronic mail address; a domain of said electronic mail address; and a location of said electronic mail address on said site on page 5, under subheading 'Managing Problems When They Occur' – page 6.

20. As per claim 52, Welter discloses (A) identifying an electronic location address of said site upon submission of said electronic location address to a search engine service which search engine service performs searches on said global communications network; (B) identifying a proprietor electronic mail address associated with a representative of a proprietor of said site upon submission of said electronic mail

Art Unit: 2113

address to said search engine service; (C) automatically including said electronic location address in a database of electronic location addresses associated with one or more additional sites which are located on said global communications network and which are monitored by said monitoring service; and (D) automatically identifying said proprietor electronic mail address as the electronic mail address to which a notification is sent upon the detection of an error on said site by said monitoring service on page 2, under subheading 'Web Server Monitoring' – page 6.

21. As per claim 53, Welter discloses (A) identifying one or more potential electronic location addresses associated with said site upon submission of an electronic location address to a domain name registry service for registration; (B) identifying at least one proprietor electronic mail address associated with a representative of a proprietor of said site upon submission of said electronic mail address to said domain name registry service; (C) automatically including said potential electronic location addresses in a database of electronic location addresses associated with one or more additional sites which are located on said global communications network and which are monitored by said monitoring service; and (D) automatically identifying said at least one proprietor electronic mail address as the electronic mail address to which said notification is sent upon the occurrence of said site event on page 2, under subheading 'Web Server Monitoring' – page 6.

22. As per claim 56, Welter discloses said site event corresponds to detection of an error in said site by the monitoring service on page 2, under subheading 'Web Server Monitoring' – page 5.

23. As per claim 60, Welter discloses remotely monitors a site located on a global communications network comprising one or more computers which monitor said site for an error, and transmit a notification to a representative of a proprietor of said site in the event said error is detected on said site; wherein the notification is at least initially sent without advance permission of the representative of said proprietor for at least an initial period on page 2, under subheading 'Web Server Monitoring' – page 4 and on page 5, under subheading 'Managing Problems When They Occur' – page 6.

Welter fails to explicitly state wherein a fee is not charged for said monitoring service for a free time period. Geller discloses this limitation on page 6, under subheading User Recommendations, "Note that SiteSeer is available for a free ten-day trial. This trial offers monitoring of up to five URLs, notification by beeper or e-mail and SiteSeer's regular reports."

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a fee not charged for said monitoring service for a free time period. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have a fee is not charged for said monitoring service for a free time period because comparisons can be made between products by different competitors to see which products are liked to the best. Geller discloses on page 6, "At least some competitors make a similar offer. There might be differences between competitors in price and other details that appeal to you, but if you want to move quickly you won't be disappointed with SiteSeer."

24. As per claim 61, Welter discloses one or more computers which monitor said site for an error, and transmit a notification to a representative of a proprietor of a linked site, which is linked to said site, in the event said error is detected on said site; wherein the notification is at least initially sent without advance permission of a representative of a proprietor of said site for at least an initial time period on page 2, under subheading 'Web Server Monitoring' – page 4 and on page 5, under subheading 'Managing Problems When They Occur' – page 6.

Welter fails to explicitly state wherein a fee is not charged for said monitoring service for a free time period. Geller discloses this limitation on page 6, under subheading User Recommendations, "Note that SiteSeer is available for a free ten-day trial. This trial offers monitoring of up to five URLs, notification by beeper or e-mail and SiteSeer's regular reports."

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a fee not charged for said monitoring service for a free time period. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have a fee is not charged for said monitoring service for a free time period because comparisons can be made between products by different competitors to see which products are liked to the best. Geller discloses on page 6, "At least some competitors make a similar offer. There might be differences between competitors in price and other details that appeal to you, but if you want to move quickly you won't be disappointed with SiteSeer."

25. As per claim 62, Welter discloses one or more computers which monitor said site for an error, and transmit a notification to a representative of a proprietor of a linked site, which is linked to said site, in the event said error is detected on said site; wherein the notification is at least initially sent without advance permission of said representative of said proprietor of said linked site for at least an initial time period on page 2, under subheading 'Web Server Monitoring' – page 4 and on page 5, under subheading 'Managing Problems When They Occur' – page 6.

Welter fails to explicitly state wherein a fee is not charged for said monitoring service for a free time period. Geller discloses this limitation on page 6, under subheading User Recommendations, "Note that SiteSeer is available for a free ten-day trial. This trial offers monitoring of up to five URLs, notification by beeper or e-mail and SiteSeer's regular reports."

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a fee not charged for said monitoring service for a free time period. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have a fee is not charged for said monitoring service for a free time period because comparisons can be made between products by different competitors to see which products are liked to the best. Geller discloses on page 6, "At least some competitors make a similar offer. There might be differences between competitors in price and other details that appeal to you, but if you want to move quickly you won't be disappointed with SiteSeer."

26. As per claim 63, Welter discloses one or more computers which monitor said site for an error, and transmit a notification to an interested third party, wherein said interested third party is a party other than a representative of a proprietor of said site, in the event said error is detected on said site; and wherein the notification is at least initially sent without advance permission of said representative of said proprietor for at least an initial time period on page 2, under subheading 'Web Server Monitoring' – page 4 and on page 5, under subheading 'Managing Problems When They Occur' – page 6.

Welter fails to explicitly state wherein a fee is not charged for said monitoring service for a free time period. Geller discloses this limitation on page 6, under subheading User Recommendations, "Note that SiteSeer is available for a free ten-day trial. This trial offers monitoring of up to five URLs, notification by beeper or e-mail and SiteSeer's regular reports."

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a fee not charged for said monitoring service for a free time period. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have a fee is not charged for said monitoring service for a free time period because comparisons can be made between products by different competitors to see which products are liked to the best. Geller discloses on page 6, "At least some competitors make a similar offer. There might be differences between competitors in price and other details that appeal to you, but if you want to move quickly you won't be disappointed with SiteSeer."

27. As per claim 64, Welter discloses one or more computers which monitor said site for an error, and transmit a notification to an interested third party, wherein said interested third party is a party other than a representative of a proprietor of said site, in the event said error is detected on said site; and wherein the notification is at least initially sent without advance permission of said interested third party for at least an initial time period on page 2, under subheading 'Web Server Monitoring' – page 4 and on page 5, under subheading 'Managing Problems When They Occur' – page 6.

Welter fails to explicitly state wherein a fee is not charged for said monitoring service for a free time period. Geller discloses this limitation on page 6, under subheading User Recommendations, "Note that SiteSeer is available for a free ten-day trial. This trial offers monitoring of up to five URLs, notification by beeper or e-mail and SiteSeer's regular reports."

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a fee not charged for said monitoring service for a free time period. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have a fee is not charged for said monitoring service for a free time period because comparisons can be made between products by different competitors to see which products are liked to the best. Geller discloses on page 6, "At least some competitors make a similar offer. There might be differences between competitors in price and other details that appeal to you, but if you want to move quickly you won't be disappointed with SiteSeer."

Art Unit: 2113

28. As per claim 65, Welter discloses said site is being monitored for the occurrence of errors, comprising one or more computers which extract at least one electronic mail address from said site, assign each said electronic mail address one or more categories, assign each said electronic mail address a priority; and identify, based upon said priority, the at least one appropriate electronic mail address to which said electronic notification is sent upon said occurrence of said error in said site; wherein said notification is at least initially performed without the advance permission of a representative of a proprietor of the site on page 5, under subheading 'Managing Problems When They Occur' – page 6.

Welter fails to explicitly state wherein a fee is not charged for said monitoring service for a free time period. Geller discloses this limitation on page 6, under subheading User Recommendations, "Note that SiteSeer is available for a free ten-day trial. This trial offers monitoring of up to five URLs, notification by beeper or e-mail and SiteSeer's regular reports."

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a fee not charged for said monitoring service for a free time period. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have a fee is not charged for said monitoring service for a free time period because comparisons can be made between products by different competitors to see which products are liked to the best. Geller discloses on page 6, "At least some competitors make a similar offer. There might be differences between competitors in price and other

details that appeal to you, but if you want to move quickly you won't be disappointed with SiteSeer."

29. As per claim 66, Welter discloses one or more computers which identify an electronic location address of said site upon submission of said electronic location address to a search engine service which search engine service performs searches on said global communications network, identify a proprietor electronic mail address associated with a representative of a proprietor of said site upon submission of said electronic mail address to said search engine service, automatically include said electronic location address in a database of electronic location addresses associated with one or more additional sites which are located on said global communications network and which are monitored by said monitoring service, and automatically identify said proprietor electronic mail address as the electronic mail address to which a notification is sent upon the detection of an error on said site by said monitoring service on page 2, under subheading 'Web Server Monitoring' – page 6.

30. As per claim 67, Welter discloses one or more computers which identify one or more potential electronic location addresses associated with said site upon submission of an electronic location address to a domain name registry service for registration, identify at least one proprietor electronic mail address associated with a representative of a proprietor of said site upon submission of said electronic mail address to said domain name registry service, automatically include said potential electronic location addresses in a database of electronic location addresses associated with one or more additional sites which are located on said global communications network and which are

monitored by said monitoring service, and automatically identify said at least one proprietor electronic mail address as the electronic mail address to which said notification is sent upon the occurrence of said site event on page 2, under subheading 'Web Server Monitoring' – page 6..

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

31. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

32. Claims 57,58,68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Geller. As per claim 57, Geller discloses generating a list of at least one recipient of a remote monitoring service, which monitoring service detects one or more events on a site located on a global communications network, wherein said list is usable for a plurality of commercial purposes in addition to said monitoring service, comprising the steps of: (A) generating said list at least initially without advance permission from said at least one recipient; (B) rendering said monitoring service by a service provider without payment by said at least one recipient; and (C) rendering said service to said at least one recipient continually until the occurrence of a terminating event on page 6, under subheading 'User Recommendations.'

33. As per claim 58, Geller discloses said terminating event is receipt by said service provider of a request by said at least one recipient to terminate said monitoring service on page 6, under subheading 'User Recommendations.'


Art Unit: 2113

34. As per claim 68, Geller discloses said list is usable for a plurality of commercial purposes in addition to said monitoring service, comprising one or more computers which generate said list at least initially without advance permission from said at least one recipient; render said monitoring service by a service provider without payment by said at least one recipient; and render said service to said at least one recipient continually until the occurrence of a terminating event on page 6, under subheading 'User Recommendations.'

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yolanda Wilson whose telephone number is (703) 305-3298. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30-4:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Beausoliel can be reached on (703) 305-9713. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


ROBERT BEAUSOLIEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100